

REMARKS

Drawings

In the Office Action, the Drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner stated that "the extending projection must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)."

Applicant has herein amended Figure 1 to show the extending projection. Support for such amendment can be found in the Specification and Claims as filed and, for example, at Page 6, lines 14-16 of the Specification. Thus, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Specification

Applicant has herein amended the paragraph of the Specification that appears at Page 6, line 7 through Page 7, line 6 to include a reference number for the extending projection that was added to Figure 1. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,002,450 to Darbee et al. ("Darbee") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,705,997 to Park ("Park"). Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Applicant traverses the rejections as follows.

Applicant submits that neither Darbee nor Park, either alone or combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 1. As stated in the Office Action, Darbee does not "disclose a light source attached to an extending projection, wherein the extending projection is attached to a top side of the housing." See Office Action, Page 3. Applicant submits that

Park, likewise, does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a light source attached to an extending projection, wherein the extending projection is attached to a top side of the housing...and wherein the light source shines down upon the input device when the light source is lit" as claimed in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that "Park teaches a light source 62 attached to an extending projection (extending projection is inherently included in the lamp 62) wherein the extending projection is attached to a top side of the housing 100 (fig. 2)." *See Id.* Applicant submits that the light source 62 of Park is not attached to an extending projection that is attached to a top side of the housing. Rather, the lamps 62 are "installed on the front surface of remote control device 100." *See Park*, col. 3, lines 59-60; Fig. 2.

Applicant reminds the Office that, in order to sustain a rejection, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ...claim." MPEP § 2131 (citation omitted). If the Office relies on an inherency of an element, "the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the prior art." MPEP § 2112. Applicant submits that the Office has not shown such a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning as to why the flush-mounted lamps 62 of Park would inherently include "an extending projection, wherein the extending projection is attached to a top side of the housing [such that] the light source shines down upon the input device when the light source is lit" as claimed in claim 1. Applicant submits that the Office has not identified such basis in fact and/or technical reasoning because none exists.

Applicant further submits that the Office has relied on inconsistent reasoning in fashioning the rejections based on Park. On Page 3 of the Office Action, the Office identifies the


light source of claim 1 as the lamps 62 of Park. On Page 4 of the Office Action, the Office identifies the light source as being the "key illuminating section 70 has small lamps installed under function keys 72 to be illuminated." Claim 1 of the instant application includes only one light source. Furthermore, assuming for sake of argument and not by way of admission that the "small lamps installed under function keys 72" are equated with the light source, the lamps are installed under the function keys, and thus such a light source does not and can not "shine[] down upon the input device when the light source is lit" as claimed in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that neither Darbee nor Park, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1 and, thus, Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie case* of obviousness and that claim 1, and claims 2-4 and 12 which depend therefrom, are patentable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for the pending claims in the present application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the present application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below in order that the Examiner's concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan C. Parks
Reg. No. 40,120

Attorney for Applicant

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Tel. (412) 355-6288
Fax (412) 355-6501